



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/856,333	08/23/2001	Kathrin Berlin	81669	7884
23685	7590	05/05/2006	EXAMINER	
KRIEGSMAN & KRIEGSMAN 665 FRANKLIN STREET FRAMINGHAM, MA 01702			SWITZER, JULIET CAROLINE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1634	

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/856,333	BERLIN, KATHRIN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Juliet C. Switzer	1634	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-16, 18-24, 26, 27 and 30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-16, 18-24, 26, 27 and 30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/24/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/24/06 has been entered.

2. This action is written in response to applicant's correspondence submitted 3/24/06. Claims 1, 26, 27 and 30 have been amended. Claims 1-9, 11-16, 18-24, 26-27, and 30 are pending. Applicant's amendments and arguments have been thoroughly reviewed, but are not persuasive for the reasons that follow. Any rejections not reiterated in this action have been withdrawn. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Claim 1-9, 11-16, 18-24, 26-27, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Each of the pending claims recites that the claimed methods must be practiced "without sequencing," however, the metes and bounds of this exclusion, and therefore the metes and bounds of what is encompassed in the claim are unclear. For example, it is unclear "without

Art Unit: 1634

sequencing” excludes any method of determining the nucleotide present at a particular position in a nucleic acid sequence, such as hybridization with allele specific probes. In this case, hybridization occurs under high stringency conditions, and the sequence of a target nucleic acid is inferred based on the hybridization of the probes. Does “without sequencing” exclude methods where the “entire sequence of a gene or gene segment” is determined (specification page 3) but not methods where only portions of a sample nucleic acid are determined? Most analysis of nucleic acid samples, indeed even restriction analysis, provides information about the sequence of the nucleic acid molecule being studied, and so, it is not clear where to draw the line in nucleic acid analysis to determine which methods are within the scope of “sequencing” and which are excluded from the scope of “sequencing.” Thus, the rejected claims are indefinite.

Claim 27 remains indefinite over the recitation in step (f) the “labeled or non-labeled nucleic acids” is confusing because it is not clear which label is being referred to since a label is added to some nucleic acid in step (a) and to heteroduplexes in step (e).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 1-6, 8, and 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rice *et al.* (Oncogene (1998) 17, 1807-1812) in view of Gifford (US 5750335).

Rice *et al.* teach a method for identifying 5-methylcytosine positions in a sample genomic DNA, said method comprising the steps of:

(a) chemically treating a sample genomic DNA obtained from at least one cell in such a way that cytosine and 5-methylcytosine react differently and from products with different base pairing behavior (p. 1811, treatment with sodium bisulfite);

Art Unit: 1634

(b) amplifying by means of a polymerase reaction a segment of the genomic DNA obtained in step (a) (p. 1811, second column);

(c) performing steps (a) and (b) on a reference genomic DNA (Figure 3, methylation was determined for eight different cell types, including normal lymphocytes and normal mammary epithelial cells);

Rice *et al.* utilize chemical treatment with sodium bisulfite in a method to identify the location of methylated cytosines in genomic DNA. Treatment with bisulfite results in the conversion of unmethylated cytosine residues to uracil, while methylated cytosine residues remain unchanged. Thus, in a sample where every cytosine was methylated there would be no change in sequence, but in a sample with very low levels of methylation, after PCR there would be thymines where the unmethylated cytosines previously were located. Rice *et al.* effectively introduce mutations nucleic acid sequences via the treatment with sodium bisulfite. When two treated samples are compared, for example a sample that was highly methylated versus one that had low levels of methylation, the treated sequences would have sequence differences at each position where there was differential methylation. Rice *et al.* compare the amplified sequences to determine the methylation positions after amplification of the sequences, comparing the sequences to the known BRAC1 sequence (p. 1811, 2nd column).

With regard to claim 2, in the method taught by Rice *et al.* positions which are variable between different cell lines are identified (see figure 3).

With regard to claim 3, Rice *et al.* utilize a bisulfite to treat the genomic DNA.

With regard to claim 4, Rice *et al.* jointly amplify genomic DNA from several cells, as they necessarily isolated DNA from more than one cell for each cell line.

Art Unit: 1634

With regard to claim 5, Rice *et al.* separately amplified the DNA from several cell lines, and then treated them all with bisulfite.

With regard to claim 8, Rice *et al.* test unmethylated cell lines (p. 1807, second column; Figure 3).

With regard to claim 18, a nucleotide sequence is considered a “chemical function” that enables a PCR product to be immobilized on a surface. Therefore, the PCR carried out by Rice *et al.* necessarily uses a primer that enables the polymerase reaction to be immobilized on a surface. The claim does not actually require an immobilization step.

Rice *et al.* do not detect the differences between amplified sequences by forming heteroduplexes from the amplified products for the comparison of a test and reference sample, and Rice *et al.* do not teach a method of determining the methylated positions “without sequencing.”

Gifford teaches a method for identifying sequence differences between two nucleic acids that comprises the steps of:

- (d) forming heteroduplexes from two different nucleic acid samples (Col. 3, lines 40-50);
- (e) introducing a detectable label into the heteroduplexes of step (d) by means of a reaction which is specific for non-complementary base pairs (Col. 4, lines 15-20), and
- (f) determining, without sequencing, the position of mismatches in the sample genomic DNA based on the presence and position of the detectable label (also Col. 5, lines 1-12).

In particular, Gifford teaches methods for detecting mismatches in nucleic acid samples by forming heteroduplexes and binding those heteroduplexes with a heteroduplex binding protein (abstract and throughout). Gifford provide a method for determining the position of the

Art Unit: 1634

mismatch in a heteroduplex based identifying the presence and position of the detectable label for example by binding sample nucleic acids to reference nucleic acids that are immobilized on a solid support, binding mismatches with a mismatch binding protein and detecting the mismatch binding protein as an indication of a mismatch (Col. 5, lines 1-12). This method determines the presence and position (i.e. that there is a mismatch within a particular nucleic reference nucleic acid) of the mismatch and of the label “without sequencing.” The presence and position of the sequence difference has been determined, at least it is known that the mismatch is within hybrid that has been bound by the binding protein.

Gifford specifically teaches comparing a sample (patient) nucleic acid fragment with a control (normal) nucleic acid fragment (Figure 2).

With regard to claims 4 and 5, Gifford teaches that a test or reference nucleic acid may include monoclonal or polyclonal cell lines (Col. 9, 22-25).

With regard to claims 19, Gifford teaches that the reference or test nucleic acids may be immobilized to a solid surface (Col. 5, lines 1-5; col. 13, lines 1-5). With regard to claim 20, Gifford teaches that “different” reference nucleic acids may be immobilized on a solid surface at different spots, which are considered different reaction vessels (Col. 5, lines 1-5). Further, Gifford teaches the transfer of the amplified products to different vessels (affinity columns or affinity matrix) for purification of the heteroduplexes wherein the products are coupled to a solid support (column 5, lines 47-56).

With regard to claim 21 and 22, Gifford teaches an using an enzyme that forms a complex with a non-complementary base pair (Col. 4, lines 10-20), specifically teaching MutS (Col. 7, line 22).

Art Unit: 1634

With regard to claim 23, Gifford teaches a method wherein the enzyme bears a label by which a complex can be displayed (Col. 15, lines 65-67).

With regard to claim 24, Gifford teaches that the label is a fluorescence label (Col. 15, lines 65-66).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the methylation detection method taught by Rice *et al.* so as to have utilized the mutation detection methods taught by Gifford. One would have been motivated to utilize the methods taught by Gifford in order to achieve the express benefits of the methods taught by Gifford which include achieving “rapid and accurate genetic screening and diagnosis by comparing two nucleic acids for differences in their sequences... (Col. 3, lines 23-25).” The combination of the two methods would have resulted in the practice of the claimed methods, and as such, the claimed invention is *prima facie* obvious. With regard to claim 6, the result required in claim 6 would have been a necessary property of the practice of the assay taught by Rice *et al.* in view of Gifford. Namely, where there was differential methylation between the sample genomic DNA and any of the reference DNA’s taught by Rice *et al.*, when these were subjected to heteroduplex analysis as taught by Gifford erroneous base pairings would have been produced at the positions at which 5-methylcytosine was located in the sample genomic DNA but not in the reference genomic DNA.

5. Claims 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 27, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rice *et al.* in view of Gifford as applied to claims 1-6, 8, and 18-24 above, and further in view of Koster *et al.* (US 6428955).

The teachings of Rice *et al.* in view of Gifford are applied herein as applied in the previous rejection. In the method taught by Rice *et al.* in view of Gifford, sodium bisulfite is used which results in the modification of unmethylated cytosines, and therefore mismatches would occur among treated nucleic acids at positions where there was relative differential methylation of sequences. Thus, after bisulfite treatment, one is left with nucleic acids that have mismatches relative to one another if the sequences are differentially methylated. Rice *et al.* in view of Gifford do not teach a method in which the heteroduplex is detected by cleavage of the heteroduplex molecule or in which mass spectrometry is used to analyze the size of the DNA fragments.

Claim 26 differs from claim 1 in that in step (b) the PCR primer is fluorescently labeled and provided with a chemical function to enable the immobilization of the amplificate on the surface, step (c) sets forth immobilizing the amplificate on a surface, step (f) utilizes a chemical mismatch cleavage methodology, and step (g) utilizes mass spectrometry, whereby in step (h) the presence or presence and position of the 5-methylcytosine within the genomic DNA is deduced from the length of the cleaved nucleic acids. Claim 27 is similar to claim 26 but requires that a detectable label is introduced into the heteroduplex by an enzymatic reaction which is specific for non-complementary base pairs. This limitation is provided in the methods taught by Rice *et al.* in view of Gifford.

Likewise, claim 30 is similar to claim 26, and thus also similar to claim 1. Steps (a)-(d) of claim 30 are similar to those of claim 1. Unlike claim 1, however, claim 30 requires that the heteroduplexes of step (d) are cleaved by a chemical mismatch cleavage reaction. Claim 9 depends from claim 30 and requires that the nucleic acid backbone of the heteroduplex is

Art Unit: 1634

specifically cleaved at the non-complementarily base paired positions by an enzymatic means.

Claims 11-15 also depend from claim 30.

With regard to claims 11-14, Koster *et al.* teach methods for analyzing the size of nucleic acid fragments using mass spectrometry, specifically teaching the use of MALDI-TOF and ESI, (Col. 18, line 66-Col. 19, line 11).

With regard to claim 15, which requires that the nucleic acids in step (e) are “adapted” to the performance capacity of the mass spectrometer, Koster *et al.* teach utilizing a variety of PCR amplification methods to obtain PCR products that they analyze using the mass spec (See examples 14-15, for example). With regard to claim 16, Koster *et al.* teach utilizing nested PCR to amplify products for detection (Examples 5 and 14, for example), a method which uses primers that are set stepwise along the DNA with respect to the inner and outer pairs of primers and produce a series of amplification products, at least one which is within the mass range detectable by means of mass spectrometry. These PCR primers are considered to be “set stepwise” since they amplify two differently sized products where on is a size “step” down from the other.

Koster *et al.* teaches a method in which a heteroduplex is cleaved by an agent that cleaves the unhybridized portion so that a mismatch results in two products and then detecting these by mass spectrometry to detect the presence of the mismatch (Col. 5, lines 30-40; Col. 23, lines 25-40). Koster *et al.* further teach primers that are labeled with biotin (a means for immobilizing an amplificate on a surface; col. 35, for example) and primers that are labeled with a radioactive label and oligonucleotides that are fluorescently labeled (Col. 49, for example). In addition, as noted previously in this office action, any nucleic acid sequence itself is considered a “chemical

Art Unit: 1634

function” that would enable the immobilization of the amplificate on a surface. Nonetheless, Koster further teach methods in which the sequence to be detected is immobilized to a solid support by means of hybridization (Col. 3, lines 60-67) or by means of a biotin/streptavidin immobilization or other reversible or irreversible bond (Col. 16, lines 7-22).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the method taught by Rice *et al.* in view of Gifford *et al.* so as to have used the amplification and detection methods taught by Koster *et al.* One would have been motivated to use mass spectrometry as a means for detection of nucleic acid fragments in order to take advantage of the express benefits of such a method as taught by Koster *et al.*, who state “the processes of the invention provide for increased accuracy and reliability of nucleic acid detection by mass spectrometry (Col. 5, lines 62-65).” One would have been motivated to use chemical cleavage to detect heteroduplexes by Koster’s specific suggestion to do so, and in order to take advantage of an additional method for detecting sequence differences among the potentially differentially methylated sequences taught by Rice *et al.* Furthermore, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to have utilized fluorescently labeled primers in place of the radioactively labeled primers taught by Koster *et al.* in order to have provided an alternative labeling method that is safer to use as opposed to using radioactivity in the laboratory.

6. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rice *et al.* in view of Gifford as applied to claims 1-6, 8, and 18-24 above, and further in view of Nazarenko *et al.* (US 6090552).

Art Unit: 1634

The teachings of Rice *et al.* in view of Gifford are applied herein as applied in the previous rejection. Rice *et al.* in view of Gifford do not teach methods wherein the reference DNA is methylated at all CpG positions.

However, the inclusion of a methylated control in an assay for the determination of methylation would have been routine at the time the invention was made. Nazarenko *et al.* teach methods for detecting methylation in samples, and teach the inclusion of methylated control nucleic acids in these assays and in kits for performing these assays (see Col. 37-38 and 49-50, for example). Thus, It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included in the assays taught by Rice *et al.* in view of Gifford *et al.* a control which is methylated at all CpG positions as taught by Nazarenko *et al.* in order to have had a standard for comparison of all results against those obtained with a methylated control.

Response to Remarks

The remarks have been carefully considered but are not persuasive. The 112 2nd rejection of claims 19, 20, and 26 are withdrawn in view of the amendments to the claims. Claim 27 remains indefinite over the recitation “labeled or non-labeled nucleic acids” in step (e). Applicant did not address this grounds of rejection in the response, and so the rejection is maintained. A new 112 2nd rejection is set forth for all of the claims.

Applicant traverses the 103 rejection under Rice *et al.* in view of Gifford stating that because of the differences involved in methylation analysis and mutation analysis, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the teachings of the references (see remarks beginning at page numbered 16). Applicant provides a description of

Art Unit: 1634

bisulfite treatment on pages numbered 17-19 of the response, explaining, in part, that bisulfite treated genomic DNA “contains a totally different base composition than genomic DNA” since bisulfite treated DNA consists over large stretches of only three bases, and thus the DNA is less complex, and that bisulfite DNA is single-stranded. Further, the response illustrates that after bisulfite treatment two strands of DNA would not be expected to hybridize because of differences due to the treatment. However, this is not persuasive to overcome the rejection of record. Rice et al. specifically teach method of PCR amplification after the treatment of DNA with bisulfite, which results in double stranded DNA PCR products comprised of the classical nucleotides. Further, control and test samples are both treated with bisulfite. Thus, the treatment and subsequent PCR amplification exemplified by Rice et al. overcomes the suggested problems suggested by the applicant’s response. Applicant further states that “As is well known in the art, methods can be used theoretically lead many times to bad results (page 19).” Insofar as this is a suggestion that there would be no expectation of success, applicant is reminded that absolute predictability is not required in order to establish an expectation of success. The MPEP states, “Obviousness does not require absolute predictability, however, at least some degree of predictability is required. Evidence showing there was no reasonable expectation of success may support a conclusion of nonobviousness (2143.02).” In this case there has been no showing that the combined methods would not have been expected to work. Attorney’s arguments do not substitute evidence on the record. Arguments regarding the remaining rejections rely on the arguments set forth against Rice et al. in view of Gifford. As these were not persuasive, the rejections are maintained.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 1634

7. No claim is allowed.

1. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Juliet C Switzer whose telephone number is (571) 272-0753. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, or Thursday, from 9:00 AM until 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla can be reached by calling (571) 272-0735.


The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571) 273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571)272-0507.

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also

Art Unit: 1634

enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Juliet C. Switzer". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending from the end.

Juliet C. Switzer
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1634

May 2, 2006